

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7 and 15-26 will remain in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-7 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Parady (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,627).

The Action indicates that because the register file of Parady contains ten ports and four banks, it inherently has at least two ports per bank.

Parady discloses a typical register file architecture, e.g., integer registers 48 in FIG. 1. The integer registers 48 include 8 windows for 4 threads and include 10 ports. However, in the embodiment taught by Applicants in the Specification, the register file set having the dual-ported RAM architecture supports four threads (page 3, line 18), 8 windows (Figure 6), and only requires 4 ports (two for each of banks A and B).

Independent claims 1, 15, and 19 have been amended to recite that each bank has no more than two ports. Because Parady describes a register file containing ten ports and four banks, it inherently includes banks with more than two ports. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 15, and 19, and their dependencies, are allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 6-10 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parady in further view of

Waldspurger et al, "Register Relocation: Flexible Contexts for Multithreading".

Claims 6-10 and 23-25 depend from independent claims 1 and 19, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are allowable for the reasons given above and for their additional limitations.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue, or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Claims 1-7 and 15-22 are in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (858) 678-4321.

Enclosed is our check in the amount of \$790 to cover the cost of the filing fee for RCE. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

/BY
KENYON JENCKES
REG. NO. 41,873

Date: December 29, 2004
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
PTO Customer No. 20985
Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099